Filed 05/30/2008

Page 1 of 3

Case 5:08-cv-02282-RMW Document 29

1

2 3

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT the First Amended Derivative Complaint and Complaint for Interference with Contract, Conversion, Declaratory and Injunctive Relief filed in the United States District Court, Northern District of California by XS Holding B.V. ("XS Holding"), derivatively on behalf of XET Holding Co., LLC and Xslent Technologies, LLC and on its own behalf (the "Federal case"), involves some facts and legal issues similar to two cases filed in the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Santa Clara and recently consolidated: XET Holding Co., LLC, et al. v. XS Holding B.V., et al., and two related crossactions, Case No. 107CV092388; and Atira Technologies, LLC v. XET Holdings Co., LLC, et al., and related cross action. Case No. 108CV106601 (the "State Action"). There currently are pending appeals in the State Action to the Sixth District Court of Appeal for the State of California.

The State Action involves two complaints and three cross-complaints for breach of contract, fraud, rescission, reformation, declaratory relief and other causes of action primarily stemming from the formation and operations of XET Holding Co., LLC and Xslent Technologies, LLC. The State Action focuses primarily on conduct occurring during 2007. The State Action does not allege or involve shareholders' derivative claims nor claims for interference with contractual relations or conversion. Nine of the fourteen parties (five or six of which recently settled) in the State Action are not parties to the Federal Case.

The Federal Case involves shareholders' derivative claims and seeks recovery on behalf of XET Holdings Co., LLC and Xslent Technologies, LLC for two of their managers' breaches of fiduciary duties, for legal malpractice and for other act occurring in 2007 and continuing into 2008. The Federal Case also names a corporation, a limited liability company and four individuals that are not parties to the State Action regarding conduct that occurred beginning in or about April 2008. Six of the eleven parties in the Federal Case are not parties in the State Action.

While the Federal Case will require evidence and proof distinct from the claims in the State Action, and there also will be some overlap. XS Holding B.V. believes that coordination of

NOTICE OF PENDENCY OF ACTIONS OR OTHER PROCEEDINGS

SEDGWICK